



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—ACCENTUAL CLAUSULAE IN GREEK PROSE OF THE FIRST AND SECOND CENTURIES OF OUR ERA.

(I. The Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians.)

It is now nearly twenty years since Professor Wilhelm Meyer, using as his starting point the earlier observations of Bouvy, set forth certain rules followed by writers of late Greek and Byzantine prose for producing rhythmical cadences at the ends of phrases and sentences. The formulation of these rules and the general limitation of the phenomena involved have been accepted without much dissent or essential modification, and pass current in the guild of scholarship under the name of Meyer's law. To the immense importance and interest of Meyer's discovery, all who have had occasion to deal with the matter, from whatever point of view, have borne willing and grateful testimony. And indeed the range of its significance is remarkably wide: for it not only discloses to our sight, but almost puts into our hands, one of the principal tools of the rhetorical workshop, it contributes to the phonology of the language, and in the field of text-criticism it affords a criterion free from the chances of mechanical error and, in varying degrees, independent of scribal caprice. It may be assumed in general that readers of this Journal are familiar with Meyer's law, but for those whose studies have not extended to the later periods to which it belongs, let it suffice here to state briefly that the phenomena embraced in it consist of certain final cadences which are constructed not by syllabic quantity, but by the collocation of word accents (primary or secondary).

Concerning the history and origins of these clausulae Meyer does not speak in his original monograph, but in the *Fragmenta Burana* (1901)¹ he observes: "Die von mir nachgewiesene Form des Schlusses, wonach vor der letzten Hebung [i. e. Accent] zwei Senkungen stehen müssen, tritt kurz vor 400 auf. In derselben Zeit hatte sich die accentuirte Form des lat. Schlusses

¹ Now in *Gesam. Abhandlungen*, Vol. I (1905), p. 19.

fixiert. . . . Die lat. accentuirte Form ist ganz natürlich aus der quantifizierenden Form [i. e. of Latin] gewachsen. Sie ist ganz sicher nicht der griechischen nachgebildet. *Kann für die griechische durchaus keine quantifizierende oder anders gestaltete accentuirte Vorstufe gefunden werden*, dann sind wir bei der grossen Ähnlichkeit des griech. und des lat. Schlusses gezwungen anzunehmen, dass ein griech. Redekünstler im 4ten Jahrhundert den lat. rhythmischen Schluss in der griech. Sprache nachgeahmt habe und dass dieser Versuch durchgedrungen sei". I have quoted this passage because in the words which I have italicised it formulates precisely that which I shall here endeavor to set forth, viz., an accentual 'Vorstufe' to the developed accentual clausulae of the early 5th century, which in turn will appear as a natural development from the earlier quantitative clausulae of Asiatic-hellenistic prose.

But before passing to the text upon which my conclusions are based, I would call attention to a brief inquiry into the accentual clausulae of Himerius, which Wilamowitz incorporated into an early series of his *Lesefrüchte* (*Hermes* 34 (1899), pp. 214-218). He finds in this rhetorician, in the middle of the 4th century, the observance of certain rules for the construction of phrase endings, not identical with Meyer's formulation, but still obviously of related character. He infers (and without doubt correctly) that what Himerius practises had been the usage of his teachers, and concludes therefore that the phenomenon may go back as far as the end of the 3d century: "Hier [i. e. at Athens] ist also gegen Ende des 3. Jahrhunderts der denkwürdige Schritt gethan, der eigentlich der antiken Tradition ein Ende macht: der Ersatz des quantifizierenden durch das accentuierende Princip in der Prosa". The observations of Wilamowitz concerning Himerius, in spite of Meyer's repudiation of them (l. c., p. 19), are unquestionably sound in principle, but his concluding generalization with its implications (which my citation does not fully reveal) is, I believe, wrong in fact and misleading in tone. For I think that it can be shown that accentual clausulae were in use at a much earlier time, and that transition from quantitative to accentual terminations was a gradual process, during which both forms appear side by side in different writers of the same time, and even side by side within the work of the same writer. There was no time of abrupt or sudden change, nor can the change be referred, I suspect, to any one writer or place or school as its author or source.

Within the limits of the present article I must confine myself practically to a single text, the Epistle to the Corinthians attributed to Clement, commonly designated as third in the succession of bishops of the Roman Church after St. Peter. Concerning the date of the letter I have accepted without independent inquiry the last decade of the first century, the period upon which practically all more recent students of the question have reached agreement.¹ It will, I suspect, require a somewhat detailed proof to make plausible to others my own conviction that accentual clausulae are in fact present in this letter; but if my conclusions win credence, I shall in a subsequent discussion trace the further history of accentual clausulae in the period before 400, and set forth the bearings of my results upon the phenomena embraced in Meyer's law, and upon the formulation of the law itself. From these introductory words the reader will gain, I fear, the impression that I have gone forth deliberately to seek the accentual 'Vorstufe' which Meyer desiderated—and there is prevalent, perhaps not without reason, a human suspicion that the philologist will find what he seeks for. But in fact I came upon the Epistle of Clement quite from the opposite direction, that is working down through specimens of Asiatic-hellenistic rhetoric, and, so far as the clausulae are concerned, contemplating them in the first instance merely from the point of view of syllabic quantity.

The Clementine Epistle to the Corinthians, as being perhaps the earliest extra-canonical writing of the Church, has engaged the attention of theological students in an exceptional degree, especially in later years, during which the discovery of important new sources of the text have greatly stimulated its investigation and study. It was first discovered in the famous Alexandrine MS of the Greek bible (A), which was presented to Charles I in 1628, and from this source the editio princeps was published by Patrick Young in 1633. This remained the unique source of the text until 1875, when Bryennius re-edited the letter from a MS of Constantinople (C), which supplied many smaller lacunae and the missing leaf at the end of A. Only a few months later a Syriac version (S) was acquired by the library of the University of Cambridge and its readings were made available by the

¹ Cf. Gebhardt u. Harnack, *Proleg.*, p. 59, Lightfoot, Vol. I, p. 346, Harnack, *Chronologie*, Vol. I, p. 255: "Unser Brief ist am Ende der Regierungszeit Domitian's zwischen c. 93-95 geschrieben, schwerlich erst 96 oder 97."

reports of Lightfoot in his 2d edition (1890). The absence of a Latin version of the epistle had led Lightfoot and others to suspect that the letter had remained relatively unknown to the Western Church, but in 1894 Germain Morin, an eminent scholar of the Benedictine order, published as the second fascicle of his *Anecdota Maredsolana* a Latin version from a MS of Namur (of about the 11th century). For the purposes of our investigation it would be very valuable to determine exactly the time at which this translation was made, but for the present I must content myself with reporting the opinion of Harnack, who agrees with Morin in placing it not long after the Greek version itself, that is rather before than after 150 A. D. Finally in the present year, as the latest addition to the noble series of *Texte und Untersuchungen*, it has been published in Coptic translation (K) by Carl Schmidt. For ordinary purposes of study and for exact information concerning the status of the text all has been done that could reasonably be asked in the thorough-going editions of Gebhardt and Harnack (2d ed., Lpz., 1876), Lightfoot (2d ed., 1890), and Knopf (Lpz., 1899), who was the first editor to make thorough use of the Syriac and Latin versions. But let me add here in passing a sigh, born of much futile page turning, that no one of those admirable books is equipped with a complete index verborum.¹ The discovery of a Coptic version (or versions) leaves something still for the definitive edition, which must form a part of the Berlin series of early Christian writers, and I venture to add, with reserve and caution, my belief that considerations of the rhythmical structure of the work will enable a subsequent editor in some places to arrive at more certain conclusions in the face of conflicting witnesses to the text.

The existence of accentual clausulae in Greek prose, like accentual rhythms in Greek verse, was of course dependent upon the gradual change of Greek accentuation from the principle of pitch or musical variation to the principle of intensity or stress. This transition had begun much earlier than the date of our document, but concerning the progress of the change it has been difficult hitherto to obtain any other data than those afforded by vulgar orthography. On this point let me quote from Kretschmer in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, Vol. 30 (1890), p. 599. After quoting

¹ In the final revision of this paper I was able to use the admirable *Index Patristicus* of Dr. E. J. Goodspeed and his pupils, lexicographical work of a self-sacrificing type which deserves the highest credit.

examples of false orthography from papyri and inscriptions he summarizes as follows: "In der Mehrzahl der Fälle sind betonte Kürzen als lang oder unbetonte Längen als kurz bezeichnet. . . . Thatsache ist also, dass die vulgäre Aussprache bereits im 2. Jahrh. v. Chr. Länge und Kürze zusammenfallen liess". He proceeds then to the conclusion, based upon the date of the evidence employed, that the transition from musical to expiratory accent, at least in vulgar and colloquial speech, must have taken place in the 2d and 1st centuries B. C. "Dieser Übergang kann nur als ein allmählicher gedacht werden, und so mögen damals noch eine Zeit lang Tonhöhe und Tonstärke neben einander fortbestanden haben."

The conditions which Kretschmer describes seem to me to fit the phenomena which the clausulae of our letter reveal with considerable accuracy. We shall find that the accent has lengthened practically all short syllables upon which it stands, but it has not yet produced a thorough-going shortening of adjacent long syllables. That is, long unaccented syllables, as well as accented syllables (whether short or long), may under certain conditions be used as the starting point of rhythmical groups, and in this fact of the presence of both rhythmical principles side by side the peculiarity and the perplexity of the rhythmical structure of our document lie.

Let me begin with a list of quantitative clausulae taken from the opening lines of the letter. I shall cite usually from the edition of Knopf, and unless otherwise indicated it will be understood that I cite only true clausulae, that is the ends of longer or shorter phrases and sentences.¹

ἐκλεκτοῖς | τοῦ θεοῦ
 ἀνοσίον | στάσεως
 οὐκ ἐκ|ρυξεν
 πάντα ἐποι|εῖτε
 νο|εῖν ἐπε|τρέπετε

¹ So far as possible, in order to eliminate subjective interpretation, I shall confine myself to those places marked by Knopf either with a comma (,) colon (:) or period (.). But as every student of these problems knows there is much superfluous, i. e., 'unphraseological', punctuation in all of our editions, while on the other hand, in some places, modern editors regularly omit punctuation where, from the point of view of colon or phrase structure, it should stand, as for example, between two co-ordinate phrases connected by καί. These circumstances frustrate the attempt to obtain with anything like completeness an objective statistic.

ἐπιτελ|εῖν παρηγ|γέλλετε
 ἀλ|αζονευ|όμενοι
 δι|δόντες ἢ | λαμβάνοντες
 ἦτε τοῖς | σπλάγχνοις
 ὀφθαλμῶν | ὤμων.

These clausulae will be at once familiar to every student of Cicero or Seneca, or of contemporary Hellenistic rhetorical prose—the cretic basis, followed by a cadence of varying type, the nature of which seems to be fundamentally trochaic, —υ— | —υ— or υ—υ—, —υ— | —υ—, and —υ— | —υ—υ—. My list is taken from the first 25 lines of the letter (after the address), and it might be extended indefinitely and illustrated with similar examples from Greek prose of nearly the same period (*περὶ κόσμον, περὶ ὕψους*, Chariton, etc.). There is therefore nothing remarkable here, nor different from what has been observed presumably by every more recent reader of Clement. Only one peculiarity do the examples reveal, viz., the fact that, while the clausulae are correct quantitatively, yet with one exception (*λαμβάνοντες*) the accents fall coincident with the rhythmical ictus. This is true in general of the quantitative clausulae in our letter. Some further evidence of it I shall instance in another connection,¹ but it will be superfluous to illustrate it in further detail at this point. In this list I have set down all the quantitative clausulae, in the portion of text chosen, about which no question could arise. In the following list I shall place all of the remaining clausulae in the same portion of text.

καὶ περιστάσεις
 παρ' ὑμῖν πραγμάτων
 ἀπονοίας ἐξέκασαν
 μεγάλως βλαφθῆναι
 οὐκ ἐδοκίμασεν
 εὐσέβειαν οὐκ ἐθαύμασεν
 οὐκ ἐμακάρισεν
 θεοῦ ἐπορεύεσθε
 παρ' ὑμῖν πρεσβυτέροις
 τοὺς ἀνδρας ἐαντῶν
 οἰκουργεῖν ἐδιδάσκετε
 πάνν σωφρονούσας
 ὑποτάσσοντες
 καὶ προσέχοντες.

In these clausulae there are present varying degrees of irregularity, when measured strictly by syllabic quantity, some of

¹ Cf. treatment of words like *πεποιθήσεις, ἀλήθεια*, etc., on p. 289.

which might be accounted for by resolutions ($\theta\epsilon|\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\pi\omicron\rho\epsilon\upsilon|\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$), by the admission of a dactylic basis ($\omicron\upsilon\kappa\ \epsilon\delta\omicron|\kappa\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha\sigma\epsilon\nu$), and perhaps by still other means. But nothing can save some of these forms as quantitative clausulae. Either they are not intended to afford a rhythmical cadence, or else they have cadence value only by virtue of the lengthening effect of the accent. And that I believe to be the case, as for instance in these examples, which no manipulation can render quantitative: $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\epsilon\rho\iota|\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma,\ \mu\epsilon|\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\varsigma\ \beta\lambda\alpha\phi|\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota,\ \pi\alpha\rho'\ \acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\ |\ \pi\rho\epsilon\sigma\beta\upsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\iota\varsigma,\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\upsilon\ \sigma\omega\phi\rho\omicron\nu\acute{o}\upsilon\sigma\alpha\varsigma$.¹ I should not therefore have recourse to resolution in the example given above, but I would read boldly $\theta\epsilon|\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\pi\omicron|\rho\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$, and so also $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron|\nu\omicron\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\xi}|\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\nu\sigma\alpha\nu$. Throughout this list it will be seen that the quantities are more or less awry, but that for the most part the accents stand in the same positions as in the preceding lists. It may be said: why assume clausulae at all in these cases? But it will be conceded by all who are familiar with the subject of prose rhythm that its manifestation, in a work where it appears at all, may be expected to be fairly regular and consistent.

I shall endeavor presently to devise something like a demonstration of the accentual character of the clausulae, as shown in certain words and word-types of frequent occurrence, but first let me add another passage which will illustrate not only the clausulae, but also the noteworthy continuous rhythm which is frequently found throughout the work. For this purpose I select ch. 45, and to avoid repetition I shall indicate at once my interpretation of the clausulae, and I add also in parallel columns the corresponding words of the Latin translation. The juxtaposition will be serviceable as furnishing a clue to the rhythm with which the Greek cadences were read by the translator.² As a specimen of continuous rhythm I shall set down the whole of the first sentence, and after that the clausulae throughout the chapter, following the punctuation of Knopf.

$\Phi\iota\lambda \acute{\omicron}\nu\epsilon\iota\kappa\omicron\iota$	$ \ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon,$	$ \ \acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\acute{\iota},$	$ \ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \zeta\eta\lambda\omega \tau\alpha\iota\ \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\ $
$\pi\rho\upsilon \delta\epsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \epsilon\varsigma$	$ \ \tau\omicron\tau\epsilon,$	$ \ \phi\rho\alpha\tau\rho\epsilon\varsigma,$	$ \ \epsilon\tau\ \zeta\epsilon\lambda\omicron \tau\iota\pi\iota\ \delta\epsilon\ $
$\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\eta \kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omega\nu\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma$	$ \ \sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu.$		
$\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\upsilon\iota \pi\epsilon\rho\tau\iota\nu\epsilon\iota\tau$	$ \ \alpha\delta\ \sigma\alpha\lambda\upsilon\tau\epsilon\mu.$		

¹ Concerning this form, see below, p. 299.

² Cf. Knopf, *Prolegomena*, p. 45: "Den Ohren, für die diese Übersetzung berechnet war, muss das Griechische als Gemeindesprache noch etwas geläufiges gewesen sein."

(clausulae)

τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς σωτηρίαν	pertinent ad salutem
ἐ ρὰς γραφὰς τὰς ἀληθεῖς	sacras scrip turas veras
πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου	spiri tu sancto cognovistis
γέγραπται ἐν αὐταῖς	neque fic tum in eis
ἀπὸ ὁσίων ἀνδρῶν	repro bato a sanctis viris
ἐδι ώχθησαν δίκαιοι	sustinu erunt iusti
ἀλλ' ὑπὸ ἀνόμων (or perhaps	sed ab in iquis
ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἀν όμων)	
ἐφυλα κίσθησαν	} om. L.
ἀλλ' ὑπὸ ἀνοσίων	
c. S. <ἀλλ' > ὑπὸ παρανόμων	lapi dati sunt ab scelestis
ζῆλον ἂν εἰληφότων	in iquum ¹ receperunt
εὐκλεῶς ἤνεγκαν	fortiter tulerunt
εἰπομεν ἀδελφοί	dicimus carissimi
	(ἀγαπητοί?)
λάκκον λε όντων	lacu le onum
θρησκείαν τοῦ ὑψίστου	ex celsi re ligionem
εἰς κάμ νον πυρός	in forna ce ignis
μηδαμῶς τοῦτο γέ νοιτο	ne quaquam hoc fiat
ταῦτα δρὰ σαντες	qui hoc ges serunt
ἐξ ήρισαν θύμῳ	conten derunt fu roris
αἰκίαν περιβαλεῖν	poenas im mittere

(continuous)

μὴ εἰδότες ὅτι ὁ ὑψιστος ἐπ έρμαχος	
ignorantes quia ex celsus pro pug nator est	
καὶ ὑπερ ασπιστής ἐστιν τῶν ἐν καθαρό συνειδήσει	
. . . . om. L.	qui puro corde de-
λατρεύντων τῷ πανα ρέτῳ ὀν όματι αὐτοῦ.	
serviunt mag nifico nomini illius. ²	

¹ *Iniquum* here, and *iniquis* above may be tetrasyllabic. In the clausulae of Ammianus -qu- usually has the value of a separate syllable.

² Concerning the Latin translation and its clausulae a word before passing on. The translator's aim was clearly to be as literal as possible, and it would be open for any one to say that (qui = quae) *pertinent ad salutem* was the inevitable literal rendering of (τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς σωτηρίαν, and that the fact of clausular agreement was therefore meaningless. The same thing might be said of a number of the other terminations, where verbatim literalness yields the same clausula in Latin as is found in the Greek. But this explanation will not apply to a large number of other examples. The sentence of the Greek text ending in the clausula πνεύματος | τοῦ ἁγίου has in the Latin been merged with the following in such a manner that the phrase does not end with *spiritu sancto*, but with *cognovistis*, corresponding to τοῦ ἁγίου. Again in the next sentence, the Greek has the clausula γέγραπται | ἐν αὐταῖς, to which the Latin corresponds with the clausula *neque fictum in eis*, omitting *scriptum est*, which would complete the translation entirely. Observe also that the Latin

It will be seen, if my interpretation is correct, that the rhythmical structure in the clausulae consists of a loose trisyllabic basis, with an accent in either or both of the places corresponding to the longs of the cretic, while instances occur of correct quantitative cretic bases with violation of accent, like *εἰς κάμψ-, αἰκίαν, θρησκειάν*. Similarly the cadence is constructed for the most part accentually, but in some instances quantitatively. So for example *σωτηρίαν* and *τὰς ἀληθείς* have both the rhythmical value of a ditrochaeus, the one accentual, the other quantitative. The continuous rhythm, as in the last three lines, is for the most part cretic, but it alternates with trochaic sequences like *συνειδήσει, λατρεύόντων*.

I will now turn to some explanations. First of all it should be stated that the apparent arbitrariness in constructing clausulae according either to accent or quantity has some limitations, and was subject to some rules dependent upon the pronunciation of the language at this time. In the transitional stage of Greek accent which Kretschmer describes, it is reasonable to believe that the lengthening of accented short syllables took place at a much earlier time than the second or complementary stage of the shortening of adjacent unaccented long syllables. That is, *πόνος* for example became trochaic much earlier than *θῦμοῦ* became iambic. In this circumstance, that long unaccented syllables still had phonetic value as longs, and still asserted a retarding force upon pronunciation, lies the possibility of using the twofold rhythmical principle which the examples reveal. Some definite groups in which quantitative value still remained will be discussed and classified below. But some arbitrariness of treatment will still remain unexplained.

Let me first take up instances of the lengthening of short vowels under the stress of the accent, or if perhaps this statement

has transposed the arrangement of words in *θρησκειάν | τοῦ ὑψίστου* = *ex|celſi re|ligionem*, thus making the final cadences identical. But the translator was not able in all cases to reproduce the same rhythm as the Greek affords, and so contented himself with another admissible type. Thus in place of the double cretic *εἰς κάμψ|ρον πυρός* he was satisfied to use the cretic-trochaic termination *in fornac' | ignis*, and in the continuous rhythm at the end he substitutes for the trochaic rhythm of *συνειδήσει | λατρεύόντων* the cretic movement of *corde de|serviunt*. The Latin clausulae afford no demonstration of the character of the Greek cadences, but they do afford a certain cumulative confirmation of a conclusion which may be reached by other means.

of the matter be inexact, let us say cases where a short syllable reinforced by the accent is allowed to stand in a place where quantitative usage would have required syllabic length. Simple examples of this type are very numerous:

3, 2	ο	ζῆλος καὶ φθόνος
3, 2	ε	ἔρις καὶ στάσις
38, 7	ᾶ	κοσ μήσας ἐ χάρη
48, 1	ᾶ	τοῦτο ἐν τᾷχει
35, 7	ε	λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή
9, 3	ε	εὐρεθεῖς μετετέθη
19, 3	ι	πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν αὐτοῦ
11, 1	ι	αἰκισμὸν τίθησιν
5, 4	ο	ὑπ ήνεγκεν πόνους
37, 5	ο	ὄλῳ τῷ σώματι
37, 5	ο	ὄλον τὸ σώμα
37, 3	υ	δύναται εἶναι

More striking, but not fundamentally different from these examples, are clausulae, the rhythm of which depends upon the accentuation of formative terminations like *-ia*, *-μένους*, *-σύνη*, *-ότες*, *-έρους*, etc.

But before turning to such examples of purely accentual treatment I would first note the treatment of certain words which yield naturally the syllabic material for correct quantitative clausulae. For example *ἀλήθεια* requires only a long syllable before it to yield the commonest form of quantitative clausula. It occurs, however, only once (35, 2), and the corresponding accusative form once also (31, 2), but in neither case in clausula. For this position we have invariably a form like *καὶ ἀληθείᾳ* (19, 1), or *τῆς ἀληθείας* (35, 5). That is to say (though the evidence of a single word is not sufficient) the writer chose for clausular position those forms in which the main accent was carried over into the final cadence, and avoided forms like *ἀλήθεια ἀληθειαν*, which deprived the cadence of such an accent, though yielding equally well correct quantitative values. Again *πεποίθησις* and *ταπείνωσις* occur only in the genitive and dative forms (7 exx.) with a preceding accent, yielding thus always a form like *καὶ ταπειν|ώσει. καὶ ταπείνωσις*, of the same metrical value in clausula, was apparently avoided.

The evidence by which the character of the non-quantitative clausulae may be determined, must be some more or less consistent grouping of accents in such a manner as to yield accentual equivalents to the quantitative forms. I have already pointed out (p. 285) that the quantitative clausulae in our letter usually

reveal coincident accent also, and in the examples just cited the apparent intention to bring about this coincidence by the choice of some forms and the avoidance of others has been seen. Let me therefore illustrate the method which I shall employ with the non-quantitative clausulae upon an example of correct quantitative structure. 'Αλαζονεία lends itself naturally by quantitative form to ditrochaic rhythm, with coincident accent. To obtain our trisyllabic basis we should expect it to be preceded in clausula by two syllables of which the first should bear the accent. This expectation we find confirmed in the two clear instances where it stands in clausula: ἐν | κόμπῳ ἀλ|αζονείας (16, 2) and πᾶσαν ἀλ|αζονείαν (13, 1). The same form occurs in the very short phrase in 14, 1 τοῖς ἐν ἀλ|αζονείᾳ. But in 21, 5 where it does not stand in clausula there is apparently no effort made to accommodate the preceding words to the ditrochaic cadence.

An *accentual* ditrochaic cadence is yielded by tetrasyllabic words ending in -ία. A list follows, which for the words selected is complete for clausular position.

7, 7	ἐλαβον σωτηρίαν
45, 1	ἀνη κόντων εἰς σωτηρίαν
59, 2	ταύτης τῆς ἁμαρτίας
47, 4	ἦττονα ἁμαρτίαν (ὕμιν ἐπ ήμεγεν.)
50, 5	δὲ ἀγ άπης τὰς ἁμαρτίας
53, 4	ἄφες τῇν ἁμαρτίαν (τῷ λαῷ τοῦτω.) ¹
2, 2	ἐν ἀγαθῇ προθυμίᾳ
33, 1	ἐκτεν είας καὶ προθυμίας
35, 5	ἀδι κίαν καὶ ἄνομίαν (A)
	πονηρίαν (L)

From the divisions into clausulae which I have made it will be seen that I interpret all of these forms as consisting of a ditrochaic cadence accentual in character. The evidence for this interpretation is found in the consistent use of the trisyllabic, quasi-cretic, basis, a rule to which I have found but one exception where the examples occur in clausula. The exception is 31, 1 οἱ ὁδοὶ | τῆς | εὐλογίας.

From the negative side this conclusion receives some confirmation from the fact that the trisyllabic basis is neglected in positions where no definite rhythmical cadence was felt to be necessary. So for example in 7, 4 we find διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν not in clausula, and two citations from the LXX, although they termi-

¹ A very free adaptation and rearrangement of Exod. 32, 32.

nate sentences, similarly show no regard for the requisite basis (18, 14 and 39, 9). Still further compare the form *σωτήριον*, which might be used in quantitative clausula with the same value as *σωτηρία*, but not if the rhythm depends upon accent. In one instance (35, 12) it concludes the chapter in a quotation from the Psalms, thus: *σω|τήριον | τοῦ θεοῦ*, where reference to the LXX will show that *τοῦ* has been inserted by our author and obviously for rhythmical effect. Again at the beginning of the next chapter (36, 1) the word is used in clausula thus: *σω|τήριον | ἡμῶν |* (*Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν*). The significant thing is that with the shift of accent the position of the word is shifted. To take still another example, we have seen that *ἁμαρτία* in clausula is preceded by a trisyllabic basis, and is therefore to be interpreted as yielding ditrochaic rhythm. But in 49, 5 the word occurs in the gen. pl. *πλήθος ἁ|μαρτιῶν*, and with the shift in accent the rhythm of the word is altered to another type (cretic), and a dissyllabic word (instead of a trisyllabic) now suffices for the construction of the proper basis.

In some cases words of this type may be employed in a slightly different rhythm, but still with observance of accent. Thus while in 47, 6 (Κο|ρινθίων | ἐκκλησίαν) we have ἐκκλησίαν as affording a ditrochaic cadence, yet in 44, 3 the first two syllables of it stand in the cretic basis thus: τῆς ἐκκλη|σίας πάσης. In this rhythm λειτουργία is found twice in clausula.

44, 2 τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτοῦ
43, 3 ἀποβάλλεσθαι | τῆς λειτουργίας,¹

but in 44, 6 *τερτ|μημένης | λειτουργίας* (with quantitative basis). But these examples testify equally with the others to the value of -*τ*- as the starting point of a rhythm. In concluding this group of tetrasyllabic words let me add in juxtaposition some examples to show the rhythmical equivalence of -*i*- and -*ei*-.

4I, 2 ἀμαρ|τίας καὶ | πλημμελείας
16, 2 οὐκ ἤλθεν ἐν | κόμπῳ ἀ|λαζονείας }
οὐδ' ὑπερ|ηφανίας. }
14, I τοῖς ἐν ἀ|λαζονείᾳ }
καὶ ἀκα|ταστασία. }

A further list of miscellaneous examples of words in *-ia* follows:

36, 2 ὀφθαλμοὶ | τῆς καρδίας
35, 5 κενοδο|ξίαν τε | καὶ ἀφιλ|οξενίαν
32, 3 τῆς δικα|οπραγίας | (ἥς κατειρ|γάσαντο)

¹ Similarly in 59, 2 καὶ ἵκε|σίαν ποι|οῦμενοι.

51, 2	δι καίως ὁμ οφωνίας
35, 1	ζω ῆ ἐν ἀ θανασία ¹
3, 2	καὶ αἰχμαλω σία.

With less violence to the rhythmical traditions of the language, but still quite irregularly, forms like ὁμονοίας-α, διανοίας-α are regularly found in clausula with ditrochaic value, preceded by the trisyllabic basis. They are significant as showing the rhythmical equivalence between -οίας-α, and -ίας-α.

There is no other group of words in which the complete parallelism of accentual and quantitative (or partially quantitative) forms can be shown so clearly. But if we may now accept the presence of certain types of clausulae as a reasonable presumption, it will be possible to demonstrate accentual rhythm for some characteristic words of more frequent occurrence. Let us take ἀγάπη.

33, 1	ἐγκατα λίπωμεν τὴν ἀγάπην
49, 5	οὐδὲν βάνανσον ἐν ἀγάπῃ
49, 5	ἀ γάπῃ οὐ στασιάζει
50, 1	θανυμασ τόν ἐστιν ἡ ἀγάπῃ
50, 3	οἱ ἐν ἀ γάπῃ τελ ειωθέντες
50, 5	ὁμο νοία ἀ γάπης
50, 5	δι' ἀ γάπης τὰς ἀμαρτίας
53, 5	ὦ με γάλης ἀ γάπης
54, 1	τίς πεπλη ροφορη μένος ἀ γάπης.

These are the only examples of the occurrence of the word in clausula, and it will be seen that in every instance some one of our recognized cadence forms is yielded, dependent for its rhythm at some point on the accent of the word. Finally a short passage of continuous rhythm from 49, 5:

ἀ|γάπῃ κολ|λᾷ ἡμᾶς | τῷ θεῷ
 ἀ|γάπῃ καλ|ύπτει || πληθὺς ἀ|μαρτιῶν.

A nice illustration of rhythmical change dependent upon the shift of accent is afforded by the three examples of ἀπόστολος which occur in clausula. We have in

42, 2	οἱ ἀ πόστολοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ
-------	-----------------------------------

¹ I have omitted from this discussion one characteristic word which is found several times in clausula, viz., ἀγαθοποιία. It occurs some three or four times and is usually preceded by a trisyllabic group, e. g., 33, 1 ἀπὸ τῆς | ἀγαθοποιίας. My first inclination was to read it with resolution thus: ἀγαθοποι|ίας. But something is to be said for the lengthening of ο in compounds, and in that case we should have to accept the remainder of the word thus: ἀγαθο|ποι|ίας, or better, ἀγα|θοποι|ίας (see p. 300).

but in

5, 3	ἀγαθοὺς ἀποστόλους
47, 1	Παύλον τοῦ ἀποστόλου

cf. also

47, 4	ἀπο στόλοις με μαρτυρη μένους.
-------	--------------------------------

A similar word is *πρεσβύτεροι*. Thus we have in

44, 5	προσδ οιπορή σαντες πρεσ βύτεροι
-------	----------------------------------

but in

1, 3	παρ' ὑμῖν πρεσβυτέρους
3, 3	ἐπὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέρους
54, 2	τῶν καθ'ε σταμένων πρεσβυτέρων
55, 4	παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων
57, 1	ὑποτά γητε τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις
21, 6	πρεσβυ τέρους τι μήσωμεν.

Note also two examples of *έτέροις*, the only occurrence of the word, or any form of it, in clausula,

55, 2	ὅπως ἐ τέρους λυ τρώσονται
55, 2	ἐ τέρους ἐ ψώμισαν.

The usage with *ἡμέρα* is obscured by a defective text, but it seems to correspond to the preceding examples,

24, 3	ἀν ίσταται ἡ ἡμέρα (ἡ, C et fort. A)
25, 4	ἡ μέρας βλε πόντων πάντων
50, 3	ἕως τῆσδε ἡ μέρας παρ ῆλθον (A.)
20, 2	ἡ μέρα τε καὶ νύξ (init., not cl.).

The usage with participial forms like *-μένος*, *-μένους*, *μένων* is not consistent, but in most instances where they occur in positions which give a clue to their rhythmical value, the rhythm will be found to depend upon the accent. This is especially true in the cadence; quantitative usage is chiefly confined to the basis.

3, 1	ἐπετελ έσθη τὸ γεγραμμένον
17, 5	χρηματισ μοῦ αὐτῷ διδομένον
23, 1	ἐπὶ τοὺς φοβου μένους αὐτόν
59, 1	δὲ ἡμῶν εἰρημένους
47, 4	ἀπο στόλοις με μαρτυρη μένους
47, 4	ἀνδρὶ δε δοκιμασ μένῳ παρ' αὐτοῖς
51, 1	παρεμ πτώσεις τοῦ ἀντικει μένον
43, 1	νενομο θετημένους (cf. νομοθέτης),

with which last example cf. ib. *συνεπι|μαρτυροῦντες*, the initial word of the phrase: a corresponsion seems intended.

The examples are numerous and only a small selection can be given, but in conclusion let us note a word of this type of frequent occurrence, *ἡγούμενοι*:

(in nom.)

32, 2	καὶ ἡ γούμενοι κατὰ τὸν Ἰούδαν
51, 5	οἱ ἡ γούμενοι αὐτοῦ (C)
55, 1	βασί λεις καὶ ἡ γούμενοι

(in obliq.)

1, 3	τοῖς ἡ γου μένοις ὑμῶν
5, 7	ἐπὶ τῶν ἡ γουμένων
37, 2	τοῖς ἡ γου μένοις ἡμῶν.

Examples of quantitative, or partially quantitative treatment (chiefly in basis):

54, 2	τῶν καθ'ε σταμένων πρεσβυτέρων
44, 6	αὐ τοῖς τετὶ μημένης λειτουργίας
35, 4	τῶν ἐπηγ γεληένων δωρεῶν.

In cadence

43, 1	κατ έστησαν τοὺς προει ρημένους,
-------	------------------------------------

and the same phrase in 44, 2.

For the participle in -ότες, etc., the material is meagre, but

45, 4	ζήλον ἀν ειληφότων
-------	--------------------

and repeatedly in continuous rhythm, as in 20, 11: ὑπερεκ|περισ-
σῶς | δ' ἡμᾶς τοὺς | προσπεφευ|γότας τοῖς | οἰκτιρμοῖς | αὐτοῦ.

It is difficult to know how much exemplification of this sort is necessary to illustrate adequately the usage of our writer, but at the risk of needless prolixity I shall still add a few characteristic examples. We have observed above that *ταπείνωσις* (*πεποιθήσις*) is always used with a preceding accent, yielding forms like *καὶ ταπεινώσει*—*ώσεως*, which are clausulae of pure quantitative type with coincident accent. *Ταπεινοφροσύνη* is a word of more frequent occurrence, and it also, in the 6 exx. of its occurrence, is always preceded by an accent, e. g.,

56, 1	καὶ ταπει νοφροσύνη
44, 3	με τὰ ταπει νοφροσύνης.

This would seem to be adequate evidence that the cadence was meant to be ditrochaic in rhythm. This is confirmed by the usage of *ἀφροσύνη*, preceded by a trisyllabic basis in 13, 1 *τύφος καὶ | ἀφροσύνη (καὶ ὀργάς)*. *Δικαιοσύνη* is a harder word. The rhythm

δι|καιοσύνη would seem to be the most natural one, and it apparently occurs in

33, 8 ἔργον δι|καιοσύνης.

The remaining examples would seem to require δικαιο|σύνη, following the analogy of δίκαιος (cf. 45, 4 ἐδι|ώχθησαν | δίκαιοι).

13, 1 κρίμα καὶ | δικαιο|σύνη (citation but altered.)

35, 2 λαμ|πρότης ἐν | δικαιο|σύνη,

and this rhythm seems confirmed by the corresponson in

48, 2 πύλη γὰρ | δικαιο|σύνη
εἰς ζῶην | ἀνεω|γνῖα (ἔστιν αὕτη).

Ἅγιος occurs frequently, especially in the phrase πνεῦμα ἅγιον. The rhythm of the word as dependent upon its accent is nicely seen in these examples :

13, 1 πνεῦμα τὸ | ἅγιον (and so 16, 2 and 58, 2)

45, 2 διὰ τοῦ | πνεύματος | τοῦ ἁγίου (and 22, 1).

In clausula it is always found in either of these forms. But contrast 2, 2 πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου, and 63, 2 διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, which are not found in clausula and which do not conform to any of the rules that have been observed. Finally note an interesting example showing variation in rhythm with shift of accent :

59, 3 ὑψίστον | ἐν ὑψίστοις
ἅγιον | ἐν ἁγίοις (ἀναπαν|όμενον.)

I have thus far devoted myself especially to demonstrating the presence of clausulae dependent upon accent for their structure. I have indicated also that there are many correct quantitative clausulae with coincident accent. But there remain still a number of clausulae which are quantitative (though not always strictly), but with violation of accent, or better without coincidence of accent. Participial forms like ἐπηγ|γελέμων | δωρεῶν I have touched upon above. Other examples are such as these :

(basis)	42, 3	τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ θεοῦ
	34, 5	ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ
	42, 5	πὺν λέγει ἡ γραφή
	51, 4	εἰς Ἄιδον ζῶντας
	45, 7	εἰς κάμ νον πυρός
(cadence)	25, 5	ἀν αγραφὰς τῶν χρόνων
	21, 8	παρ ὰ θεοῦ ἰσχύει
	33, 3	ἐαυτοῦ δυνάμει
	30, 3	δικαι ούμενοι μὴ λόγοις.

Concerning the explanation of such cases I am somewhat at a loss. May it be that the stress accent was still not strongly marked, and had the effect only of retarding the movement of the (cretic) rhythm, not of destroying it? Or it is a license admitted against the writer's habitual usage (but familiar to him from contemporary and earlier literature) for the sake of constructing the desired clausulae more easily? Both considerations probably have something to do with the truth of the matter.

There is, however, a group of words, usually found in quantitative positions, in which I do not doubt that there is present a peculiarity of the pronunciation of a transitional time. I refer to dissyllabic words with a final accent and with long penultimate syllable (or trisyllabic words of the same structure plus a light initial syllable) such as *βωμός* (or *βοηθός*). The phenomenon is so characteristic and illustrates so well a condition of instability between accent and quantity that I shall make a rather full enumeration of examples.¹

5, 1	γενο μένους ἀθ λητάς
9, 4	ζῶα εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν
24, 5	ἐκφέρει καρπὸν
25, 4	ἡλίου βωμόν
38, 2	ἐπιχορη γεῖτω τῷ πτωχῷ
39, 2	δύναται θνητός
42, 5	τοῦτο οὐ καινῶς
45, 2	ἱερ ὰς γραφὰς τὰς ἀληθεῖς
47, 6	Χριστῷ ᾧ γωγῆς
47, 6	καὶ λίαν αἰσχροῖ
48, 5	ἦτω τις πιστός
58, 1	ἀπει θοῦσιν ᾧ πειλάς
59, 3	κινδυνευ όντων βο ητόν

The same phenomenon appears in verb forms such as 25, 2 *εἰσέρχεται* | καὶ *τελευτᾷ* and 5, 7 *δύσεως* | *ἐλθών*. This does not exhaust the words of this class, but it will suffice for illustration. The characteristic feature of these examples is the long penult, which final accent has not yet shortened. In consequence the weight of this syllable takes away from the force of ultimate accent, and makes it possible and natural to use the words with

¹ Related to this class, but handled with much more freedom, are the pronouns *ἡμεῖς*, *ὑμεῖς*, *αὐτός*, which are used with the rhythmical ictus upon either syllable indifferently, and so also *Ἰησοῦς* and *Χριστός*. The dissyllabic prepositions *ἀπό*, *ὑπό*, *ἐπί*, etc. share this treatment, as is true also of the later periods embraced in Meyer's law. See *exx.* in Meyer, Vol. II, p. 210.

their original quantitative values.¹ It may be recalled in this connection that Nonnus, in the construction of his hexameters, deviates from his general rule, of coincidence of accent and quantity in the 5th and 6th foot, only with occasional words of this type: ἀνδρῶν, βουλῇν, ὀπωπή, κεραυνῶν, and the pronouns ἡμεῖς, ὑμεῖς, αὐτός, are a few examples selected at random.

As rules to be mastered by any one who would read the composition correctly these details would be intolerable, but in practice it will be found that they are all yielded easily, and for the most part inevitably, when once the general proposition is apprehended, that our work represents a transitional stage from quantitative to accentual rhythm, a stage in which the developing stress accent had already lengthened most short syllables, had shortened some long syllables, but had not yet obliterated the quantitative value of others. It mirrors a living condition of a transitional time, a condition which made it even possible for the same syllable, according to the rhythmical context in which it stands, to be treated at one time with quantitative value, and at another time with neglect of quantity. This last statement will doubtless seem a hard doctrine to accept, but I think that its truth can be made reasonably apparent.

Take for example ἄκοντες, which by itself might in our author constitute either the basis or the cadence of a clausula. But in 2, 2 it stands in this rhythmical position: εἴ τι ἄ|κοντες ἢ|μάρτετε. The accent of the word here attaches itself to the preceding quasi-cretic foot, leaving the long syllable -κοντ- to become the starting point for the basis of the clausula. That is to say, the treatment becomes quantitative because the accent has been absorbed by the preceding context. This is what I mean by saying that the usage may be determined by the rhythmical context. Again λάβωμεν by itself may afford the customary trisyllabic basis, as in 24, 4 λάβωμεν | τοὺς καρπούς; but in ἀναλά|βωμεν, the two initial syllables, yielding a suitable secondary accent, usurp the main accent, and leave the long syllable -βω- free to become the starting point of another rhythmical group, as in 56, 2 ἀναλά|βωμεν παι|δείαν. If still another syllable is added (ἐγκατα|λίπωμεν) the accent may resume its place at the beginning of the foot as in

¹ Contrast with these, trisyllabic words with long penult plus *long* initial syllable. Here the reinforcement of initial secondary accent has been sufficient to allow them to stand in cretic position. E. g. 46, 9 πολλοὺς εἰς | δίσταγμα; 11, 1 αἰκισυὼν | τιθήσιν; 56, 1 οἰκτιρυμῶν | μνεῖα.

33, 1 ἐγκατα|λίπωμεν | τὴν ἀγάπην. But in cases such as λάβωμεν or λίπωμεν it is not my thought that the time value of pronunciation was the same as if the second syllable were short, like (ἐ)λάβομεν or (ἐ)λίπομεν. The long ω of the subjunctive was still felt with an effect of retardation of utterance, and this retardation in turn was sufficient, when the accent could attach itself to a preceding context, to allow the retarding long syllable to become the starting point of another rhythmical group. The phenomenon does not, therefore, seem to me arbitrary, but probably subject to the conditions of the pronunciation then prevailing. Let the following examples serve to illustrate the usage: those on the left hand may be called roughly quantitative, those on the right accentual.

2, 2	εἴ τι ἄ κοντες ἤ μάρτετε	29, 1	αἶροντες πρὸς αὐτόν
51, 5	ἐρυνθρὰν καὶ ἀπὼ λοντο	55, 2	ἐ τέρους λυ τρώσσονται
45, 7	ταῦτα δρᾶ σαντες	7, 1	ὑπομιμ νήσκοντες
49, 1	δύνатаι ἐξηγή σασθαι	27, 2	ὁ παραγ γείλας μὴ ψεύδεσθαι

Theoretically one might sometimes be in doubt as to which form was intended, as in 55, 1 ἐθνῶν ἐνέγκωμεν, but in such cases I feel confident that the accentual cadence should be preferred—ἐθνῶν ἐν|έγκωμεν. Finally both forms appear in the same context in 7, 6 ὑπακού|σαντες ἐ|σώθησαν, and more strikingly in 44, 4 ἐ|ποίησαν | καὶ ποιή|σουσιν. The application of these principles to the reading of the text will be found for the most part easy and free from perplexity. Let me take a passage of continuous rhythm from 20, 2 (a rhapsody on the order of the universe), the commata of which I shall make graphic by separate lines:

ἡ|μέρα τε | καὶ νύξ
τὸν τεταγ|μένον
ὑπ' αὐτοῦ | δρόμον
διανύ|ουσιν
μηδὲν ἀλ|ληλοῖς
ἐμποδί|ζοντα.

Or again at the end of the same chapter (20, 10):

τά τ' ἐλά|χιστα τῶν | ζώων τὰς | συνελεύσεις
αὐτῶν ἐν | ὁμονοίᾳ | καὶ εἰρή|νῃ ποιοῦνται.

There is a license of usage which disturbs the regularity of the clausulae, which in lieu of better term I venture to call an extra-metrical anacrusis. Its occurrence is relatively quite infrequent, and yet the number of cases is in fact considerable. The nature

of the phenomenon may best be seen in some passages of continuous rhythm, which in the nature of things cannot be treated so strictly as the clausulae. Take, for example, 46, 7 ἵνα τί | δι|
 ἔλκομεν | καὶ δια|σπῶμεν τὰ | μέλη τοῦ | Χριστοῦ; The writer's inten-
 tion to construct a continuous series of (accentual) cretics is
 apparent, but he allows himself the freedom of using the initial
 syllable of διέλκομεν extra-metrically. The usage occasions no
 surprise in such passages as this, but the question arises as to
 how freely it is admitted into the more carefully constructed
 clausulae. The number of certain instances in which it occurs in
 such position is relatively so small that it would seem clearly to
 have been avoided. But of the admissibility of the license there
 can be no doubt. For example, in 45, 4 we have the clausula
 ζῆλον ἀν|ειληφότων; but in 3, 4 we have ἀσεβῇ | ἀν|ειληφότας. Again,
 in the consistent series of examples like ἐλαβον | σωτηρίαν, we find
 as noted above (p. 290) one exception in 31, 1 οἱ ὁδοὶ | τῆς | εὐλογίας.
 The syllable thus treated is usually of light accent, and does in
 fact only slightly interrupt the rhythmical movement of the
 cadence. Let these examples suffice for illustration:

37, 4	δίχα τῶν με γάλων
63, 2	τῇδε τῇ ἐ πιστολῇ
29, 1	εὐσπλαχνον πα τέρα ἡμῶν
43, 2	ὁ νόματι κε κοσμημένη.

The short chapter 31 is very exceptional in that, of a total of eight clausulae, it presents five examples of this type. Practically its effect is to transform the quasi-cretic character of the basis into ditrochaic rhythm, and so to give to the whole clausula the effect of trochaic movement.

This movement, in fact, is found in a few other clausulae, in which we cannot reasonably speak of such an anacrusis.¹ I refer to examples such as these:

1, 3	πάνν σωφρο νούσας
3, 4	δικαιο σύνη καὶ εἰ ρήνη
5, 7	τόπον ἐπο ρεύνθη. ²

¹ I have used this term to describe only those cases in which an apparently superfluous syllable intervenes between a regular trisyllabic basis and the final cadence. In the examples above δίχα τῶν, τῇδε τῇ, etc., the preceding basis is clearly defined by natural syllabic grouping: in πάνν σωφρονοῦσας, etc., it is not.

² These examples correspond to not uncommon accentual clausulae of later Latin, like *ille properabat*. The Latin form would seem to have been derived from the accentual treatment of such a resolved form as *esse videatur*.

The number of these clausulae is not great, but if we should put them together with the preceding examples, characterized by an anacrusis, and accept the whole group, not as a sharply defined clausula, but merely as evidence that our writer was satisfied at times with a somewhat indeterminate trochaic rhythm in clausula, we should have a formula which would cover practically all exceptions to our regular forms. To this class then I should assign ἀγα|θοποι|τα referred to above, and it would afford a consistent explanation for the otherwise puzzling δεσπότης. This word affords a perfect quantitative cretic, but the presumption, that our investigation up to this point has established, is that its accent should determine its rhythm thus: δεσ|πότης. This presumption is confirmed by clausulae such as these:

7, 5	ἔδωκεν ὁ δεσπότης
9, 4	δι έσωσεν δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ δεσπότης
36, 2	διὰ τούτου ἡ θέλησεν ὁ δεσπότης
55, 6	τὸν παντεπ όπτην δεσ πότην
64, 1	θε ὸς καὶ δεσ πότης τῶν πνευμάτων

and in confirmatory contrast, with shift of accent,

59, 4	ἀξι σμέν σε δέσποτα.
-------	------------------------

But on the other hand we have the phrase δεσπότης τῶν ἀπάντων, where our usual rule of trisyllabic basis would give us δεσπότης as a cretic. In this case, however, it proves to be misleading, as the analogy of another word shows. For we find δημιουργός in the same phrase in several instances, and there can be no doubt, I think, about the necessary rhythm of this word, thus

26, 1	δημι ουργός τῶν ἀπάντων.
-------	----------------------------

Upon its analogy we may read, I feel confident,

8, 2	ὁ δεσ πότης τῶν ἀπάντων
33, 2	δημι ουργός καὶ δεσ πότης τῶν ἀπάντων
20, 11	ὁ μέγας δημι ουργός καὶ δεσ πότης τῶν ἀπάντων.

Similar trochaic rhythm is afforded also by the remaining examples:

11, 1	ποι ήσας ὁ δεσ πότης
36, 4	οὕτως εἶπεν ὁ δεσ πότης.
56, 16	τοῖς παι δευο μένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ δεσ πότου.
49, 6	ἡμᾶς ὁ δεσ πότης.

The fondness of our author for this rhythm in such resonant phrases as *ὁ δεσπότης τῶν ἀπάντων* may be due to the familiar formula of the doxology, *τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*.

Concerning hiatus it is to be said that our author shows much the same indifference as is found in the writings of the New Testament. Only the simplest cases are avoided by elision which our MSS have usually recorded.

With regard to resolutions there is not much to record. In the accentual clausulae of later Greek and Latin they play a very small rôle, and this condition is foreshadowed here. The examples that I have noted are chiefly of compounds with *ἐπι*.

7, 1	νοῦθε τοῦντες ἐπι στέλλομεν
33, 1	ἀγαθὸν ἐπιτελεῖν
40, 2	ἐπιμελῶς ἐπιτελεῖσθαι (Lightfoot)
28, 1	μαρὰς ἐπιθυμίας
44, 2	ἐπινομήν ἔδωκαν
52, 1	ἐξ ομολογεῖ σθαι αὐτῷ (cf. 51, 3)
34, 7	ἐπ αγγελίων αὐτοῦ .
25, 2	ἀποθανεῖν αὐτό
45, 7	αἰκίαν περιβαλεῖν.

It would be untimely to claim at once any value for these observations in questions of text criticism. But I will not refrain from pointing out in a few instances (out of many) of conflicting evidence, which forms agree with the rhythmical habit of our author, and which are at variance with it. Thus in 24, 3 Knopf reads *ἀνίσταται ἡμέρα*; but the more natural cadence is afforded by C, *ἀνίσταται ἡ ἡμέρα*, with which Tischendorf's reading of A agrees. In 38, 2 Knopf reads *μὴ λόγοις μόνον ἀλλ' ἐν ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς*. But C and A omit *ἐν*, and this omission yields such a rhythmical clausula as might be expected:

<i>μὴ λόγοις μόνον</i>	non tantum verbis
<i>ἀλλ' ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς.</i>	sed et o peribus bonis. ¹

In 30, 6 Knopf reads, with A, *ὁ ἔπαινος ἡμῶν ἔστω ἐν θεῷ, καὶ μὴ ἐξ αὐτῶν*. But before *θεῷ* C affords *τῷ* and so gives the balance of clausulae which seems most natural:

<i>ἔστω ἐν τῷ θεῷ</i>
<i>καὶ μὴ ἐξ αὐτῶν.</i>

¹ The insertion of *et* shows the translator's desire to obtain, in addition to verbatim literalness, a suitable form of clausula.

But these are trifles, and indeed it is likely that text criticisms can expect little more from the disclosure of rhythmical technique than such considerations as may help to restore external form.

I am aware that there are many questions upon which I have not touched, and some, such as the matter of hiatus and elision which demand more thorough consideration. But I hope to have made it plain that I submit my results in no dogmatic spirit, but interrogatively, and in the hope that more competent students may give answer to some of the questions which I have raised.

G. L. HENDRICKSON.

YALE UNIVERSITY, NEW HAVEN.